



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/536,736

05/27/2005

Louis Dubertret

P08652US00/BAS

4693

881 7590 07/20/2009

STITES & HARBISON PLLC  
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET  
SUITE 900  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KARPINSKI, LUKE E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/536,736	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DUBERTRET ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LUKE E. KARPINSKI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LUKE E. KARPINSKI. (3) BILL SCHULMAN.

(2) JOHANN RICHTER. (4) BENOIT DUBERTRET.

Date of Interview: 17 July 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 25.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nearn et al and Chen.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The ZnO particles of Nearn et al were discussed and the inventor explained that said particles are not considered quantum dots, further, the particles of Nearn et al. do not have a core/shell structure and therefore no longer read on claim 25. 112 rejection issues regarding claim 25 were also discussed, including the method of using language and the 'treated in this way' language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/L. E. K./ Examiner, Art Unit 1616	/Johann R. Richter/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616
---------------------------------------	---